

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

REMARKS

The Office Action of July 12, 2005, considered and rejected claims 1-46. Claims 1-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, as the claims allegedly contain contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such as to enable one skilled in the art of which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 1-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lalwaney (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,377).¹

By this paper, claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 22, 24, 25, 43, and 45 have been amended. Claims 13 and 42 have been cancelled, and claim 47 has been added.² Accordingly, following this paper, claims 1-12, 14-41 and 43-47 are pending. Of these, claims 1, 22, 25, 43, and 45 are the only independent claims at issue.

1. Abstract Content

The Examiner has requested a new Abstract which more aptly describes the claimed invention. An amended Abstract of the Disclosure is provided above. Particularly, in light of

¹ Although the prior art status and some of the assertions made with regard to the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art, as well as any official notice, which was taken in the last office action, at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, such as, for example in a subsequent amendment or during prosecution of a related application. Accordingly, Applicants' decision not to respond to any particular assertions or rejections in this paper should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to said assertions or rejections.

² Support for the claim amendments and new claim, including amendments related to automatically, and without user intervention pushing an identifier representative of the services consumer modules will consume, and providing an automated request without user intervention are clearly supported by paragraphs [0012] and [0052], among other passages throughout the specification. Amendments related to providing configuration information associated with external service providers are clearly supported by paragraph [0058] and [0070], among other passages throughout the specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the pending claims do not add new matter, and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

the amended Abstract of the Disclosure, Applicants respectfully submit that the content of the Abstract of the Disclosure is proper.

2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the "claim(s) contain subject matter which was not described in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention." Office Action, page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse.

a. *Prima Facie* Case of Lack of Enablement

As recited in M.P.E.P. § 2164.04, the burden falls initially on the Examiner to establish a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention. The underlying test to determine enablement has been expressed as "whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with the information known in the art without undue experimentation." *U.S. v. Telectronics, Inc.*, 857 F.2d 778, 785, 8 USPQ2d 1217, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1988); M.P.E.P. 2164.01, 8th ed. Rev. 2. Undoubtedly, unless the Examiner's analysis and conclusion rests on the accepted legal test for enablement, it cannot provide a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention.

When a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is made, the Examiner must construe the claims and provide a reasonable explanation as to why the scope of protection provided by a claim is not adequately enabled by the disclosure. M.P.E.P. § 2164.04. Following such a construction of claim terms, the Examiner should examine the evidence as a whole to determine whether the enablement standard is met. The Examiner's examination and conclusion should be based on the following factors, as identified in M.P.E.P. §§ 2164.01(a) and 2164.04:

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
- (B) The nature of the invention;

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

- (C) The state of the prior art;
- (D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
- (E) The level of predictability in the art;
- (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
- (G) The existence of working examples; and
- (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Each of these identified factors, and the evidence related to each, must be considered by the Examiner in drawing his conclusions. M.P.E.P. § 2164.01(a). If the Examiner determines that the evidence as a whole leads to a conclusion of lack of enablement, the language in the Office Action should focus on these "factors, reasons, and evidence that lead the Examiner to conclude that the specification fails to teach how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation." M.P.E.P. § 2164.04 (emphasis in original).

Despite the legal standard of undue experimentation, and clear focus the M.P.E.P. places on examining the specification in light of whether it enables a person of ordinary skill to practice the claimed invention without undue experimentation, Applicants note that the Office Action fails to, in even a single occurrence, discuss undue experimentation. In particular, the Office Action fails to address any of the previously identified factors, including whether any quantity of experimentation would be necessary by a person of ordinary skill in the art, and fails to detail any conclusion that the claimed invention could be practiced only after unreasonable or undue experimentation by a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Instead, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has relied on an erroneous legal standard to determine enablement. For example, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-46 are non-enabled for "failing "to disclose how exactly the system identifies and retrieves the particular configuration information associated with the services the particular consumer module will consume by using an email address, a portion or the domain thereof." Office Action, page 2

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

(emphasis added). Undue experimentation—not exactness—is the legal standard for determining whether a disclosure is enabling.

The Examiner's exactness standard would allow a finding of enablement only where the specification effectively allows practice of the claimed invention without any experimentation. However, the "test for enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue." *In re Angstadt*, 537 F.2d 498, 504, 190 USPQ 214, 219 (CCPA 1976); M.P.E.P. § 2164.01.

Because the legal standard for enablement is based on whether a claimed invention can be practiced only after undue experimentation, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not supplied a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention. Accordingly, the Examiner has not met his burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of lack of enablement. See M.P.E.P. § 2165.05.

In support of the rejection for lack of enablement, the Examiner also notes that, with respect to claims 1-46, the "specification fails to disclose the relationship between Figures 1-5." Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's argument is also insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of lack of enablement.

At most, the Examiner asserts that the specification fails to disclose essential relationships between components. However, should an examiner conclude that information is missing about one or more essential parts or relationships between parts or components, the examiner should also "specifically identify what information is missing and why one skilled in the art could not supply the information without undue experimentation." M.P.E.P. § 2164.04 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to identify any reason why any allegedly missing information could not be supplied by one having ordinary skill

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

in the art without undue experimentation. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to meet the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of lack of enablement.

Accordingly, and for at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to provide a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention. For each of the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

a. Merits of the Rejection

Because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of lack of enablement, no responsive arguments are necessary from Applicants. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2165.05. However, out of an abundance of caution, Applicants also address the merits of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-46 based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-46 as being based on a disclosure that is not enabling. Specifically, the Examiner stated that disclosure is not enabling because "[t]he specification fail[s] to disclose how the configuration information as received by consumer modules would reduce the amount of configuration information manually entered by a user." The Applicants, however, respectfully disagree.

As previously noted, the underlying standard to determine enablement is based on whether the specification teaches those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *See* M.P.E.P. 2164.01. Further, "[a]ll that is necessary is that one skilled in the art be able to practice the claimed invention, given the level of knowledge and skill in the art." M.P.E.P. § 2164.08.

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

Turning to the specification as filed, ample guidance is provided to a person having ordinary skill in the art to enable the person having ordinary skill in the art to understand how configuration information as received by the consumer modules would reduce the amount of information manually entered by a user, thereby allowing practice of the invention without undue experimentation. For example, the Background and Relevant Art states:

[c]onfiguring a computer system to use a network service often requires a user to manually enter multiple configuration parameters that are associated with the network service. For example, when configuring electronic mail, a user may need to manually enter the identity of an incoming electronic mail server, an outgoing electronic mail server, an electronic mail domain, a type of electronic mail, a username, and a password.

Specification, ¶ 3. The Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiments goes on to note that configuration information, such as that for electronic mail, may be stored in a searchable table or database. *See, e.g.* Specification, ¶¶ 42-43, 46. This stored information can be accessed and provided to a consuming computer system. *Id.* Once provided to the consuming computer system:

[t]he modules that consume the services receive the accessed configuration information. This may include a consuming computer system automatically populating fields in a form, which would otherwise be populated by manual entry of configuration information.

Specification, ¶ 14 (emphasis added).

Clearly, therefore, the act of receiving the accessed configuration information can include, for example, automatic population of the configuration information in lieu of manual entry of the same. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear that when reading the specification, those skilled in the art would understand that receipt of the

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

configuration by a consumer module can include, for example, automatic population of fields, thereby reducing at least manual entry of configuration information by a user.

The Examiner further stated that disclosure does not enable claims 1-46 because "[t]he specification fails to disclose how exactly the system identifies and retrieves the particular configuration information with the services the particular consumer module will consume by using an email address, [or] a portion o[f] the domain thereof" and "how configuration information is retrieved using identifier, email address or domain, etc." Office Action, pages 2-3. The Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants respectfully note that independent claims 1, 22, 25, 42, 43, and 45, and the dependent claims thereon, do not recite "identify[ying] and retriev[ing]" the configuration information associated with the services the consumer module will consume by using an email address or a portion of the domain thereof. Notably, claims 1 and 43, recite a method or computer program product "accessing the configuration information resulting from the search". Claims 22 and 42 recite steps for providing configuration information, and claims 25 and 45 recite "automatically, and without user intervention, causing identification of configuration information associated with the one or more services that will be consumed." Moreover, these features are fully supported by an enabling disclosure.

For example, the Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to paragraphs 73-83, on pages 26-30. In the identified paragraphs, the specification specifically identifies an exemplary routing in the Extensible Markup Language ("XML") which can be used to identify configuration information associated with an email address, or a portion of a domain thereof. For at least this reason, claims 1, 22, 25, 42, 43, and 45, and claims 2-21, 23-24, 26-41, 44, and 46, which depend from therefrom, are supported by a fully enabling disclosure.

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that Figure 2 shows all "the components recited in the claims." However, the Examiner further noted that the claims are not enabled because the "specification fails to disclose the relationship between Figures 1-5" and particularly the relationship Figures 2, 4, and 5 have with Figures 1 and 3. Applicants, however, respectfully disagree.

As noted in the specification, Figure 1, illustrates a "general-purpose computer system in the form of telephonic device 100" so as to provide a "general description of a suitable computing environment in which the invention may be implemented." Specification, ¶¶ 31-32. The specification further notes that "each of the computer systems illustrated in Figure 2 may be a general-purpose computer system that includes components similar to those previously discussed." Specification, ¶ 41. Accordingly, at least one embodiment of the claimed invention is disclosed and which clearly identifies a relationship between the telephonic device 100 in Figure 1 as an exemplary general-purpose computer system such as may be used as the Consuming Computer System, Requesting Computer System, or Configuration Computer System illustrated in Figure 2.

As to the relationship between Figures 2 and 3, telephonic device 300 and laptop 341 are specifically identified as exemplary embodiments of a Consuming Computer System. Specification, ¶¶ 55-56. Further, a Consuming Computer System may be the same computer system as the requesting computer system. *See, e.g.* Specification, ¶ 47. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would, without undue experimentation, be able to practice the invention with at least telephonic device 300 or laptop 341 acting as the Requesting Computer System.

Further, servers 361A-C, and 380 are each discussed as exemplary embodiments of a Configuration Computer System. Specification, ¶¶ 56, 58, 60. Accordingly, for at least the

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification identifies a relationship between Figures 2 and 3, and that the claimed invention is enabled as a person having ordinary skill in the art could exercise the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Having pointed out exemplary paragraphs of the specification which identify the relationship between Figures 1 and 3 with Figure 2, Applicants respectfully submit that the relationship Figures 1 and 3 have to Figures 4 and 5 is also clear to a person having ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification provides sufficient disclosure of the relationship between Figures 1-5 so as to permit one having ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear that one skilled in the art, when reading the specification, would understand how to make and use the methods, computer systems, and computer program products of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-12 and 14-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-46 were also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for "failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention." Office Action, page 3.

In particular, claim 1 was rejected for: (1) having "no functional relationship between the method steps," including "steps 1 and 2." In response, Applicants respectfully note that claim 1 does not recite "steps", but recites a method comprising various acts. Nonetheless, claim 1, particularly as amended, clearly identifies that that causing a search for configuration information (i.e. act 2) is associated with the services represented by the identifier representative

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

of services the consumer modules will consume (i.e. act 1). Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 and, any claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner has not specifically identified any "steps" or acts in any dependent claims, or in independent claims 22, 25, 42, 43, and 45 which lack a functional relationship. Nevertheless, Applicants submit that claims 22, 25, 42, 43, and 45, particularly as amended, recite acts and steps with the clarity necessary to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected those claims "directed to accessing an identifier including [a] portion of an email address or domain thereof and searching for the configuration information associated with the services the consumer modules will consume" for not describing "how exactly the system identifies and retrieves the particular configuration information associated with the services the particular consumer module will consume by using a portion of an email address." Office Action, page 3. Presumably, the Examiner refers to claims 2-5, which depend from independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As noted in the M.P.E.P., "[t]he examiner's focus during examination of claims for compliance with the requirement for definiteness of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is whether the claim meets the threshold requirements of clarity and precision, not whether more suitable language or modes of expression are available." M.P.E.P. § 2173.02. Further, this essential inquiry into clarity and particularity must be analyzed in light of: (1) the content of the specification; (2) the teachings of the prior art; and (3) the claim interpretation that would be given by one possessing the ordinary skill in the pertinent art. *Id.*

Therefore, as required in the M.P.E.P., the whether claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded by the Applicants as their invention must be

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

considered in light of the disclosure in the application. As noted above, specification clearly describes that configuration information for electronic mail services can be embedded in a searchable database or table. *See, e.g.* Specification, ¶¶ 42-43, 46. Further, an exemplary XML routine is described in detail, and in which a portion of an electronic mail address or domain is used to allow a system to identify configuration information associated with the services the consumer modules will consume. *See*, Specification, ¶¶ 73-83. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the claims directed to accessing an identifier including a portion of an electronic mail address or domain are not indefinite, as a person having ordinary skill in the art would understand the metes and bounds of the Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn to all such claims, including the rejection of at least claims 2-5.

Independent claims 1, 22, 25, 42, 43, and 45 were specifically rejected for not showing "how the configuration information as received at the consumer modules would reduce the amount of configuration information manually entered by a user," and for there being "no recitation as to how the consumer module is configured by the received configuration information such that the amount of configuration information manually entered by a user is reduced." Office Action, pages 3-4. Applicants, however, respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully note that breadth of a claim is not equated with indefiniteness. *In re Miller*, 441 F.2d 689, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971); M.P.E.P. § 2173.04. To the extent the Examiner believes a claim is not supported by the original description or by an enabling disclosure, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is appropriate. M.P.E.P. § 2173.04. Nevertheless, Applicants again note that the specification specifically details that an act of the consumer modules receiving accessed configuration information can include "automatically

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

populating fields in a form, which would otherwise be populated by manual entry of configuration information." Specification, ¶ 14. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 22, 25, 42, and 45, and dependent claims 2-21, 23-24, 26-41, 43-44, and 46, which depend therefrom, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 14 was specifically rejected as it was "not seen how the act of searching for configuration information is related to an identifier being redirected." Office Action, page 4. In light of the Examiner's duty to consider indefiniteness in light of the disclosure, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to paragraphs 44-45 of the specification. As detailed therein, a requesting computer may request a search for configuration information that is ultimately received by a configuration computer system. Specification, ¶ 44. The search request, however, may not travel directly between the requesting computer and the configuration computer system. *Id.* Instead, the request may pass through one or more remote computer systems which cannot satisfy the request, and which redirect the request until it is ultimately received by the configuration computer system. Specification, ¶¶ 45, 60-61.

The Applicants respectfully also respectfully note that the present application identifies that the present invention contemplates the use of different configuration computer systems, where each contains configuration information for different services. Specification, ¶ 70. For example, a request for electronic mail configuration information and news group configuration information may be sent to a configuration computer system containing only electronic mail configuration information. Specification, ¶ 71. Accordingly, to obtain the news group configuration information, the request may be redirected to one or more servers containing the news group configuration information. *Id.* Particularly in light of the identified paragraphs

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

within the originally filed application, and in recognition that the claimed invention can be practiced within a distributed computing environment (*see, e.g.*, Specification, ¶ 30), Applicants respectfully submit that the relationship between searching for configuration information and the redirection of an identifier or search is clear. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-12 and 14-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

4. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 22 are generally directed to methods in a requesting computer system for automatically causing configuration information associated with the services of a service provider to be received at consumer modules that consume the services, so as to reduce the amount of configuration information manually entered by a user. Claim 43 is generally directed to a computer program product incorporating the method of claim 1. As amended, claims 1, 22 and 43 recite that the respective methods comprise an act of, automatically, and without user intervention, pushing an identifier representative of the services the consumer modules will consume. This can be useful, for example, to avoid errors which commonly occur due to manual entry of configuration parameters. Additionally, this automated reception of configuration information can allow a user to use services such as electronic mail, despite a lack of technical expertise in knowing the configuration information which would otherwise be manually entered, or knowing how to input the configuration information.

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

Claim 25 is directed to a method in a configuration computer system providing configuration information for services, for sending configuration information associated with one or more services, so as to reduce the amount of configuration information manually entered by a user. Claim 45 generally corresponds to a computer program product incorporating the act recited in claim 25. The methods recited in claims 25 and 45 include an act by the configuration computer system of receiving an automated request for configuration information associated with one or more services that will be consumed by consumer modules in a consuming computer system, where the automated request was provided without user intervention.

Claim 42 is also generally directed to a method in a configuration computer system providing configuration information for services, for sending configuration information associated with one or more services, so as to reduce the amount of configuration information manually entered by a user. The configuration computer system in claim 42, however, provides configuration information associated with services provided by external service providers.

Various references were cited in the Office Action to reject the claims. However, only the Lalwaney reference was used to reject the independent claims at issue.³

The Lalwaney reference includes disclosure that appears to describe a computer system having a packet processing relay agent (PPRA) which inserts an IP address of a phone modem into a packet sent to a server address of a cable network headend. Lalwaney, col. 4, ln. 19-45. The packet is created when a user requests Internet access, and the packet is then sent to the cable headend to request initialization of a cable modem. Lalwaney, col. 5, ln. 39-48. In

³ Inasmuch as the dependent claims are distinguished over the primary reference of record, for at least the reasons discussed herein with regard to the independent claims, it is unnecessary to specifically address the rejections of the dependent claims. Additionally, as Applicants find the secondary references to be no more relevant than the primary reference, it is unnecessary to specifically address the secondary references. Nevertheless, it will be appreciated that this should not be construed as acquiescing to any characterizations made regarding the secondary references. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the purported teachings of any of the cited references at any future time.

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

response to the request for Internet access, the cable service provider sends an IP address and configuration information for the cable modem to the telephone modem and the PPRA. *Id.*

Lalwaney fails, however, to disclose or suggest the methods, systems, and computer program products recited in the pending claims. For example, Lalwaney fails to disclose or suggest a method which includes an act of automatically, without user intervention, pushing an identifier representative of the services consumer modules will consume. Although Lalwaney appears to disclose a method for attaching an IP address in a packet sent over a telephone line and to a cable headend, with the purpose of receiving an IP address and configuration information for a cable modem, Lalwaney clearly fails to disclose a method in which an identifier representative of consumer services is pushed automatically, without user intervention. In fact, Lalwaney teaches away from the method recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Lalwaney notes that the establishing a link between the telephone modem and the service provider is *in response to a user request to access the Internet*. Lalwaney, col. 5, ln. 39-43, 65-67. Accordingly, Lalwaney discloses sending a packet as an initialization request and "in response to a user request," and fails to disclose or suggest automatically, and without user intervention, pushing or receiving an identifier representative of the services consumer modules will consume, as claimed in claims 1, 22, 25, 43, and 45. Consequently, Lalwaney fails to make obvious the method recited in claims 1, 22, 25, 43, and 45 of the present invention, particularly in combination with the other recited claim elements.

Lalwaney further appears to suggest that the packet is sent to, and a link is established between, the consumer's computer system and the service provider. Lalwaney, col. 5, ln. 33-45. Lalwaney fails, however, to teach or suggest a method, in a configuration computer system that provides configuration information associated with *external* service providers, for sending

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

configuration information associated with one or more services, so as to reduce the amount of configuration information manually entered by a user. In particular, Lalwaney teaches sending the packet to the "service provider (e.g., ISP)," and obtaining the IP address from the service provider. *Id.* Accordingly, Lalwaney teaches that a service provider provides the IP address and associated configuration information for its own service, and does not teach a configuration computer system that provides configuration information associated with external service providers, as recited in claim 42. Accordingly, Lalwaney fails to disclose or suggest a method in a configuration computer system that provides configuration information associated with external services providers, for sending configuration information associated with one or more services. As a result, Lalwaney fails to make obvious the method recited in claim 42 of the present invention, particularly in combination with the other recited claim elements.

In view of at least the foregoing, it will be appreciated Lalwaney clearly fails to make obvious the claimed invention. With regard to the foregoing remarks, Applicants note that the foregoing discussion focused mainly on the independent claims, such that many of the rejections of record, such as those made to various dependent claims, have not been specifically traversed. Nevertheless, it is not necessary that every rejection be traversed inasmuch as all of the pending claims, including the new claims, should now be allowed and distinguished over the art of record, for at least the reasons provided above. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to specifically challenge any of the rejections of record, at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, including any official notice.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Application No. 10/060,489
Amendment "A" dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 12, 2005

Dated this 15 day of September, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:cnn:ppa
PPA0000001038V001

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.